

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

"Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102"

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action the Examiner continues to maintain objections against the claims on the basis of Wright et al. Furthermore, in paragraph 6 the Examiner indicates that our previous submissions were not persuasive as these documents meet the limitation of providing a printed document and an device which allows the user enter information about the greeting card.

We respectfully submit however that the Examiner has missed the most important feature of the claim in making these comments and in particular that the printed document has at least one user interactive element with which a user interacts to select a card using a sensing device.

In particular, whilst Wright et al may describe the possible of printing documents, there is no description anywhere in this document of providing a sensing device which capable of interacting with a user interactive element provided on the printed document. Instead, the user must utilise an input device such as a keyboard, stylist, or the like to input information directly into the computer. None of the input devices described are capable of interacting with a user interactive element provided on a printed document.

In particular, it is clear that the stylist must be used in conjunction with a tablet which is a standard input computer device and does not represent the novel application of utilising a printed document having user interactive element with which the sensing device can interact.

However, to further clarify this inventive feature, the claim has been amended to refer specifically to the printed document having coded data thereon, at least some of the coded data representing at least one user interactive element. The claim also now specifies that the sensing device is adapted to sense the coded data and a card accordingly.

This is described for example on page 14 onwards which describes the coded data in the form of a tag. The use of the tag map on page 19 onwards, the use of the sensing device in a form of a netpage pen are on page 27 onwards and the nature of the interaction of the netpage pen with the printed document

As this only clarifies the nature of the user interactive element and the manner in which sensing is achieved, this does not introduce new subject matter for consideration. We would therefore appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the revised claim and in particular would appreciate an indication of allowance of the application due to the novelty and inventive step of this feature.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new

matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 40, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762